DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 054 JC 830 048

AUTHOR Ostertag, Bruce A.; Baker, Ronald E.
TITLE An Analysis of Assessment Instruments in Use by the California Community Colleges to Identify and Assess Students with Specific Learning Disabilities.
PUB DATE Jan 83
NOTE 78p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Educational Diagnosis; *Informal Assessment; *Learning Disabilities; *Standardized Tests; State Surveys; Student Evaluation; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In 1982, a survey of California community colleges was conducted to determine the formal and informal devices used to identify and assess learning disabled average (LDA) students; the characteristics, skills, and behaviors measured; the personnel who administered the assessment instruments; and the intake process and identification and assessment instruments recommended for LDA students. Study findings, based on responses from all 106 colleges surveyed, revealed that 80 of the schools had formal programs for identified LDA students, 13 operated some other type of service, and that approximately 7,962 LDA students were receiving formal or informal services. With respect to the 80 colleges with formal programs, the study found: (1) 94% conducted intake interviews; (2) 80% accepted assessment results from other agencies and 81% conducted standardized assessments to obtain further data; (3) informal assessments were used by 64 respondents to complement formal testing practices; (4) the Wide Range Achievement Test, the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Revised) were used by more than 70% of the respondents; (5) reading, auditory perception, achievement, and arithmetic were the areas most frequently tested using formal assessment tools; and (6) a learning disability specialist was most often responsible for administering tests. The 20-item questionnaire used to collect data on the LDA programs is included in the Appendices. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229054

AN ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS IN USE BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO IDENTIFY AND ASSESS STUDENTS WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

Submitted By:

Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag, Assistant Professor
Department of Special Services/College of Education
c/o California State University, Sacramento
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

Dr. Ronald E. Baker, Enabler/Coordinator
Handicapped Student Services
c/o Mira Costa College
One Bernard Drive
Oceanside, CA 92054

Submitted To:

Mr. Robert F. Howard, Coordinator/Administrator
Handicapped Student Programs and Services
c/o California Community College Chancellor's Office
1122 "S" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

JANUARY, 1983

JC 830 048

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Ostertag

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ABSTRACT

This is the second report based upon a survey sent to the California community colleges regarding programming for Learning Disabled (LDA) students. This report looked at the identification and assessment of LDA students in detail. One-hundred percent (106 total) of the colleges responded to the survey questions. Over 75 percent of the community colleges operated formal programs while an additional twelve percent provided informal services for their LDA student population. Formal programs were scrutinized regarding their current practices with LDA students. This report is supplemental to an initial study entitled, A Report of the California Community College Learning Disabled Programs, submitted in July, 1982 to the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. This report analyses in greater detail the assessment instruments/tests in use in these college LDA programs to identify and assess LDA students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables. i

Introduction. 1

Background. 1

Need for the Study. 2

The Problem 4

Statement of the Problem. 4

Assumptions of the Study. 4

Limitations 5

Methodology 5

Results 6

Respondent Characteristics. 6

Program Characteristics 6

Identification Instruments. 7

Assessment Tools/Purpose of Measurement 8

Evaluators' of Assessment Tools 21

Respondent Recommendations. 29

Discussion/Recommendations. 31

Selected Bibliography 33

Appendix A - Additional Tables. 36

Appendix B - Questionnaire. 40

Appendix C - Formal LDA Program Sites 54

Appendix D - Informal LDA Program Sites 57

Appendix E - Null LDA Sites 59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Programs at Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) Students During 1980/81 .	6
2.	Areas in which informal tests were used to identify students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs	7
3.	Tests used in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification of assessment purposes	9
4.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Achievement.	10
5.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Intelligence Quoitent/Adaptive Behavior Skills	11
6.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Perceptual-Motor skills.	12
7.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Visual-Perception skills	13
8.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Auditory-Perception skills	14
9.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Classroom Behavior	15
10.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Arithmetic skills.	16
11.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Reading skills	17
12.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Spoken Language.	18
13.	Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Written Language skills.	19

TABLE PAGE

14. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) program for the purpose of measuring Vocational skills 20

15. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Learning Disability Specialist. 22

16. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Psychologist. . . . 23

17. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Speech Therapist. . 24

18. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by other in-school Faculty 25

19. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Counselor 26

20. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by an Aide 27

21. Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by an Other staff in the school. 28

22. Identification procedures recommended by twenty percent or more respondents associated with formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) 29

23. Tests recommended by twenty percent or more respondents associated with formal programs for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification or assessment purposes 30

24. Purpose of administered assessments in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) 36

25. Personnel and Evaluators of administered assessments used in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) 37

26. Intake interviews conducted on potential students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs. . 38

27. Acceptance of assessment results from other agencies for placement of students into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs 38

TABLE PAGE

28. Formal assessments administered to potential candidates for acceptance into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs 38

INTRODUCTION

This report contains specific information drawn from statewide research project conducted by Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag and Dr. Ronald E. Baker during Spring, 1982. The research team was also assisted by Ms. Laurel Best and Mr. Robert F. Howard in the development, dissemination and description of the project. The study sought answers regarding California's community colleges and services available to those students considered to have a learning disability. This report focuses on the following aspects of that study: 1) the formal and/or informal devices given to identify and assess learning disabled students; 2) the assessment areas which were measured; 3) personnel who administered and/or evaluated those assessment tools; 4) the intake process recommended by the respondents for identifying learning disabled students; and 5) the measurement tools recommended by the respondents for identifying and assessing learning disabled students.

Following an initial review of literature pertaining to post-secondary education for the learning disabled, it was discovered that no specific study had been completed and published addressing the proposed research items. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, as well as other organizations and authors, have published recommended assessment instruments or recommended methods. However, no study has identified which assessment instruments or methods are actually being utilized. This study identifies and reports, using descriptive statistics, charts, instruments presently being used and recommended by personnel working with learning disabled students in California Community Colleges.

Background

Identified adults with specific learning disabilities are a relatively new phenomenon in post-secondary education. Their participation in college is requiring a reevaluation of the types of programs and services offered in all segments of post-secondary education. Dr. Barbara Cordoni (1982) noted there is a minimum of such programming and services nationwide. However, this is not altogether true in California where the Community Colleges have been providing extensive services for the last five-to-seven years for students identified as having specific learning disabilities. The California State Universities and Universities

of California have also provided services, though on a smaller scale, for the past several years. The purpose of this study was to describe research conducted in the California Community Colleges on existing programs and services for adults with learning disabilities. Under the label of Learning Disabled Average (LDA), these students are attending and receiving services in the majority of the community colleges.

The definition for Learning Disabled has undergone substantial refinement during the last half-decade in the California Community Colleges. The colleges no longer adhere to the identification and assessment models operating in the K-12 special education system, though post-secondary education does deal with many adults who have attended that system. The community college definition of LDA is still in a state of transition. Various colleges are now operating LDA programs under the definition guidelines developed by the California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED), Learning Disabilities Division. As of this writing, the Community College Chancellor's Office has adopted the following CAPED draft:

> "A specific learning disability refers to disorders in which an individual exhibits a significant/severe discrepancy between the current level of developed intellectual abilities and academic performances despite regular instruction and educational opportunity, as currently measured by professionally recognized diagnostic procedures. Academic performance refers to achievement in the following areas: listening comprehension, oral expression, written expression, basic reading skills, reading comprehension, mathematical calculation and reasoning. Specific Learning Disabilities are often due to constitutional, genetic and/or neurological factors and are not primarily due to: visual or auditory sensory deficits, motor handicaps, severe emotional distrubance, environmental or economic disadvantage, cultural/language difference, or mental retardation (1982)."

Need for the Study

A study describing the "state of the art" in California Community College programs for LDA students was necessary for reasons of accountability and program improvement. Inconsistencies in programming throughout the state have led to confusion and, in some few cases, charges of non-compliance

with state and chancellor office mandates. It was also feasible that programs could be in compliance with the law and yet not be providing appropriate education for their learning disabled students. A comprehensive description of present LDA programs would provide information which could be beneficial for the post-secondary LDA students. This study could lend itself as a resource for the Chancellor's Office, administrators of LDA programs, specialists working with L.D.A. students, and college instructors of special education. Additionally, the accumulated data could serve as a possible reference point for future studies.

THE PROBLEM

The problem of this research was to identify and describe the means by which California Community Colleges assessed LDA students. College programs were explored according to the areas of: assessment tools, involved personnel, and processes.

Statement of the Problem

More specifically, the problem examined programming for LDA students by determining answers to the following questions:

1. What assessment tools and approaches were used for identification and diagnostic purposes?
2. What assessment areas were measured?
3. Who administered and/or evaluated the assessment tools?
4. What identification processes are recommended by personnel involved with LDA students?
5. What measurement tools are recommended by personnel involved with LDA students?

Assumptions of the Study

Several basic assumptions formed the basis for the questions of this study. First, there was no official coordinated programming between community college districts in the areas of assessment strategies, content and priorities, and identification procedures for LDA programs. Second, the expertise of specialists working with LDA students was, generally, quite professional, but not all community colleges had specialists available in their programs. Many LDA students were being served by staff unfamiliar with and/or not certified in the area of learning disabilities. Third, though community college LDA programming was not coordinated statewide, there was a commonality of teaching techniques, tools, and administration. This assumption was based upon the belief that specialist-training through graduate-college coursework stressed somewhat similar instruction in this field. Most specialists of the LDA have been instructed with convergent methods, texts, and assessment tools.

Limitations

The following limitations should be taken into account in this study. In all cases, the usual error factors that occur in any research existed, such as inadvertent inaccuracies and misinterpretation of question content by respondents.

1. Personal interviews based upon a written questionnaire were used to collect a representation of the data.
2. A mailed questionnaire was used to collect the bulk of the data.
3. Other records, documents, and statistics were used to formulate this investigation.
4. The processing of the obtained data.
5. Learning disability theories are relatively new and unproven. The lack of longitudinal studies to support these theories will limit the utility of this research.

Methodology

A questionnaire was developed and field tested through personal interviews. This selected group of college personnel examining the questionnaire indicated an understanding of the questions; therefore no significant item modifications were made.

With the clarity of the questionnaire confirmed, the questionnaire was mailed to all the public California Community Colleges. In total, 106 community colleges were contacted. The study was conducted during April and May, 1982.

RESULTS

One-hundred-and-six colleges our of the total 106 participated in this study for a return of 100 percent. The Community College Chancellor's Office and California Association for Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED) assisted in obtaining the high return by requesting every college to respond.

Respondent Characteristics. Forty-one percent of the respondents identified themselves as Coordinator/Enabler of Handicapped Services. Twenty-seven percent identified themselves as an instructor in an LDA program and a like percentage indicated they were either psychologists, counselors, or other faculty.

Program Characteristics. Table 1 indicates the type and size of programs at California's Community Colleges for LDA students. Programs were designated as formal or informal. Formal programs were considered to have all those services offered to LDA students in an informal program plus: 1) an LDA specialist; 2) a standard, routine assessment procedure for each student; and 3) the option of conducting special classes. With these guidelines, eighty of the responding colleges indicated that they had a formal program for identified LDA students. An additional thirteen colleges stated that they operated some type of service other than a formal program. Only thirteen of the respondent colleges did not serve LDA students in any capacity. Some 7,962 LDA students were receiving services in formal or informal programs through 88 percent of California's Community Colleges.

TABLE 1: Programs at Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) Students During 1980-81.

Type of Program for LDA	Number of Colleges	Percent of Colleges	Number of LDA Students Served	Percent of LDA Students Served
Formal	80	75.4	7,631	95.8
Informal	13	12.3	331	4.2
None	13	12.3	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	7,962	100.0

The Ostertag and Baker's (1982) Chancellor's Office study reported further, pertinent program characteristics. Appendices C, D, and E lists the college sites by formal, informal or null programs for L.D.A. students.

Identification Instruments. Several questionnaire items addressed the issue of identification. The following data focuses in on information provided by the 80 respondents from colleges with formal programming for LDA students.

Intake interviews were given by ninety-four percent of the respondents who operate a formal LDA program. An extra four percent occasionally held intake interviews with potential LDA students (see Aypendix A, Table 26).

Following the above interviews, eighty-eight percent of the existing formal LDA programs accepted assessment results from other agencies for placement purposes. Standardized assessments were given by eighty-one percent of these programs to obtain further pertinent data. Additionaly, fifteen percent said they sometimes gave these tests (see Appendix A, Tables 27 and 28). Informal assessments were given by sixty-four respondents to complement the above testing practices. The most used informal test was a test of written language (see Table 2).

TABLE 2: Areas in which informal tests were used to identify students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Areas	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency[a]	Percent[b]	Frequency[a]	Percent[c]
Written Language	59	55.7%	55	68.8%
Reading	36	34.5	32	40.0
Arithmetic	34	32.1	30	37.5
Specific Learning Abilities/Modalities	29	27.4	27	33.8
Classroom Behavior	29	27.4	27	33.8
Spelling	27	25.5	25	31.3
Overall Achievement	25	23.6	24	30.0
Spoken Language	24	22.6	24	30.0
Intellectual Performance/ Adaptive Behavior	18	17.0	17	21.3

[a]More than one response permitted.
[b]Based upon 106 responses. Seventy responses were valid with 36 responses missing.
[c]Based upon 80 responses. Sixty-four responses were valid with 16 responses missing.

ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Three formal assessment tools were in use by more than seventy percent of those respondents who used testing instruments in a formal program. In rank-order, these three tests were: 1) Wide Range Achievement Test (W.R.A.T.); 2) Peabody Individual Achievement Test (P.I.A.T.); and 3) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (P.P.V.T.-R). Five additional tests were in use by at least half of the respondents: 4) Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (D.T.L.A.); 5) Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery; 6) Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test; 7) Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (W.A.I.S.-R); and 8) KeyMath. One test in use by forty percent or more respondents was the: 9) Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. Table 3 lists these tests plus several others in use by twenty-five percent or more of the responding colleges.

Purposes of Measurement. Tables 3 through 14 indicate the purpose of administration of the various assessment instruments used by twenty-five percent or more of the formal programs for LDA students. The survey instrument listed the following options for the purposes of measuring:

1. Achievement
2. Intelligence Quotient/Adaptive Behavior Skills
3. Perceptual-Motor Skills
4. Visual-Perception Skills
5. Auditory-Perception Skills
6. Classroom Behavior
7. Arithmetic Skills
8. Reading Skills
9. Spoken Language
10. Written Language Skills, and
11. Vocational Skills.

Each of the above measurement areas are reported based on the responses from the eighty (80) formal programs for LDA students.

TABLE 3: Tests used in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification or assessment purposes.

Test	Number of Colleges[a]	Percent[b]
1. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	70	87.5
2. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	58	72.5
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	58	72.5
4. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	48	60.0
5. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	44	55.0
6. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	43	53.8
7. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	42	52.5
8. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	40	50.0
9. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	38	47.5
10. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	31	38.8
11. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	31	38.8
12. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	30	37.5
13. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	30	37.5
14. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	29	36.3
15. Raven-Progressive Matrix	27	33.8
16. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	23	28.8
17. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	22	27.5
18. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability	22	27.5
19. Keystone Visual Screening Test	21	26.3
20. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery	21	26.3

[a]More than one response possible.
[b]Based upon 80 respondents.

Measuring Achievement. Table 4 indicated the tests in use for the purpose of measuring achievement. The fifteen tests in use by the formal programs indicate the wide variety of assessment instruments available to college personnel in evaluating student achievement. However, several of the instruments were in use in fewer than 10 colleges statewide.

TABLE 4: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Avhievement.

Tests Used to Measure Achievement	Frequency	Percent[b]
1. Wide Range Avhievement Test (WRAT)	54	67.5
2. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	50	62.5
3. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	36	45.0
4. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	13	16.3
5. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	13	16.3
6. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	11	13.8
7. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Scales	11	13.8
8. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	8	10.0
9. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	7	8.8
10. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	3	3.8
11. Raven-Progressive Matrix	3	3.8
12. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	2	2.5
13. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	2	2.5
14. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	2	2.5
15. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Intelligence Quotient/Adaptive Behavior Skills. Table 5 indicated the tests in use for the purpose of measuring intelligence quotient/adaptive behavior skills. Several tests were used by only a few colleges.

TABLE 5: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled (LDA) programs for the purpose of meausuring Intelligence Quotient/Adaptive Behavior skills.

Tests Used to Measure IQ/Adaptive Behavior	Frequency	Percent[b]
1. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	39	48.8
2. Woodcock-Johnson Pyschoeducational Test Battery	30	37.5
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	24	30.0
4. Raven-Progressive Matrix	24	30.0
5. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	14	17.5
6. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	13	16.3
7. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	5	6.3
8. Bender-Visual Motor Gestalt Test	4	5.0
9. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	2	2.5
10. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	2	2.5
11. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Battery	1	1.3

aBased upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Perceptual-Motor Skills. Table 6 indicates the tests used by formal programs for the purpose of measuring perceptual-motor skills. In general very few colleges reported that they administer tests in this area. Only 32.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they use Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA) and/or the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test for the purpose of measuring perceptual-motor skills.

TABLE 6: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Perceptual-Motor skills.

Tests Used to Measure Perceptual-Motor Skills	Frequency	Percent[a]
1. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	26	32.5
2. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	26	32.5
3. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	18	22.5
4. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	13	16.3
5. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	7	8.8
6. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	3	3.8
7. Raven-Progressive Matrix	3	3.8
8. Keystone Visual Screening Test	2	2.5
9. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3
10. KeyMath Diagnostic Math Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Visual-Perception Skills. Table 7 indicated the test in use by formal programs for the LDA for the purpose of measuring Visual-Perception skills. In rank order, the most popular three tests in use were the Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA), the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery, and the Keystone Visual Screening Test. Several of the other reported tests were in use at less than ten colleges.

TABLE 7: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Visual-Perception skills.

	Test Used to Measure Visual Perception	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	36	45.0
2.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	23	28.8
3.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	17	21.3
4.	Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	16	20.0
5.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	12	15.0
6.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	12	15.0
7.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	9	11.3
8.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	3	3.8
9.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	3	3.8
10.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	1	1.3
11.	Peabody Range Achievement Test (PIAT)	1	1.3
12.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	1	1.3
13.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	1	1.3
14.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Auditory-Perception Skills. Table 8 indicated the tests in use at colleges operating formal programs for the LDA for the purpose of measuring Auditory-Perception skills. Two tests were used by over 50% of the respondents and an additional five tests were used by over 20 percent of the respondents.

TABLE 8: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Auditory-Perception skills.

	Tests Used to Measure Auditory-Perception	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	43	53.8
2.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	42	52.5
3.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	28	35.0
4.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	25	31.3
5.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	21	26.3
6.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery	19	23.8
7.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	19	23.8
8.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	8	10.0
9.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	6	7.5
10.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	6	7.5
11.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	4	5.0
12.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	2	2.5

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Classroom Behavior. Table 9 indicates the tests used for the purpose of measuring classroom behavior. College personnel are not administering formal assessments to measure classroom behavior. Only four tests were identified and fewer than 4% of the respondents used any one of these assessments.

TABLE 9: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Classroom Behavior.

	Tests Used to Measure Classroom Behavior	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Keystone Visual-Screening Test	3	3.8
2.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	1	1.3
3.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	1	1.3
4.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Arithmetic Skills. Table 10 indicates tests in use by the formal programs for LDA students for the purpose of measuring arithmetic skills. Four tests were in use by over 30% of the respondents, with one test, the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), being used by 65% of the colleges.

TABLE 10: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Arithmetic skills.

	Test Used to Measure Arithmetic	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	52	65.0
2.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	39	48.8
3.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	38	47.5
4.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	26	32.5
5.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	2	2.5
6.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	1	1.3
7.	Gates-MacGinite Reading Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Reading Skills. Table 11 indicates the tests in use by formal programs for the purpose of measuring reading skills. Several tests were used to measure reading skills. Over 50% of the respondents reported using the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and/or the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT).

TABLE 11: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Reading skills.

	Tests Used to Measure Reading	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	49	61.3
2.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	41	51.3
3.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	32	40.0
4.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	31	38.8
5.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	30	37.5
6.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	23	28.8
7.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	23	28.8
8.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	10	12.5
9.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	6	7.5
10.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	2	2.5
11.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery	1	1.3
12.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3
13.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	1	1.3
14.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Spoken Language. Table 12 indicates the tests administered for the purpose of measuring spoken language. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R) was used by 40% of the respondents.

TABLE 12: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Spoken Language.

	Test Used to Measure Spoken Language	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	32	40.0
2.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	22	27.5
3.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	18	22.5
4.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	10	12.5
5.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	8	10.0
6.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	4	5.0
7.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	3	3.8
8.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	3	3.8
9.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	3	3.8
10.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	2	2.5
11.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery	2	2.5
12.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	1	1.3
13.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	1	1.3
14.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Language Skills. Table 13 indicates the tests in use for the purpose of measuring written langauge skills. Forty percent of the respondents use the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and 31.3 percent use the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery.

TABLE 13: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Written Language skills.

	Test Used to Measure Written Language	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	32	40.0
2.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	25	31.3
3.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	14	17.5
4.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	6	7.5
5.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	1	1.3
6.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	1	1.3
7.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3
8.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	1	1.3
9.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	1	1.3
10.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

Measuring Vocational Skills. Table 14 indicates the tests in use for the purpose of measuring vocational interest. One test, the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, was used by 37.0 percent of the respondents. Only two respondents indicated that they use the vocational section of the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery.

TABLE 14: Tests administereed in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs for the purpose of measuring Vocational Interest.

	Tests Used to Measure Vocational Interest	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	30	37.5
2.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	2	2.5
3.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	1	1.3
4.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	1	1.3
5.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	1	1.3
6.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

EVALUATORS OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS

The Learning Disability Specialists were the largest groups of individuals who administered and evaluated tests Tables 15 through 21 indicate the tests used by the following group of college personnel working in formal programs for LDA students:

1. Learning Disability Specialist;
2. Psychologist;
3. Speech Therapist;
4. Other in-school Faculty;
5. Counselor;
6. Aide;
7. Other External to the School.

TABLE 15: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Learning Disability Specialist.

	Tests Given by Learning Disability Specialist	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	58	72.5
2.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	53	66.5
3.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	45	56.3
4.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	41	51.3
5.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	41	51.3
6.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	38	47.5
7.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	37	46.3
8.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	28	35.0
9.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	27	33.8
10.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	25	31.3
11.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	23	28.8
12.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	22	27.5
13.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	19	23.8
14.	Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	17	21.3
15.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	16	20.0
16.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	16	20.0
17.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability ((ITPA)	15	18.8
18.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	13	16.3
19.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	10	12.5
20.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	5	6.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 16: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Psychologist.

	Tests Given by Psychologists	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	26	32.5
2.	Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	15	18.8
3.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	8	10.0
4.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	6	7.5
5.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	4	5.0
6.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	4	5.0
7.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	4	5.0
8.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	3	3.8
9.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	2	2.5
10.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	2	2.5
11.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	2	2.5
12.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	2	2.5
13.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	1	1.3
14.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	1	1.3
15.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 17: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Speech Therapist.

	Tests Given by Speech Therapists	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	12	15.0
2.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	12	15.0
3.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	11	13.8
4.	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA	9	11.3
5.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	7	8.8
6.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude	7	8.8
7.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	5	6.3
8.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	3	3.8
9.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	3	3.8
10.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	2	2.5
11.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	2	2.5
12.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 18: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by other in-school Faculty.

	Tests Given by Other Faculty	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	6	7.5
2.	Gates-MacGinite Reading Test	3	3.8
3.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	2	2.5
4.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	2	2.5
5.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test	2	2.5
6.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	1	1.3
7.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	1	1.3
8.	KayMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	1	1.3
9.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	1	1.3
10.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 19: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by a Counselor.

	Tests Given by a Counselor	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	22	27.5
2.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	6	7.5
3.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	4	5.0
4.	Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	3	3.8
5.	Wide Range Achievement Test	3	3.8
6.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	2	2.5
7.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	2	2.5
8.	Woodcock-Johnson Pyschoeducational Test Battery	1	1.3
9.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	1	1.3
10.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	1	1.3
11.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 20: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by an Aide.

	Tests Given by an Aide	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	15	18.8
2.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test	8	10.0
3.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	8	10.0
4.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	7	8.8
5.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	5	6.3
6.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	5	6.3
7.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	3	3.8
8.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	3	3.8
9.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	3	3.8
10.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	3	3.8
11.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	2	2.5
12.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	2	2.5
13.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	2	2.5
14.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	1	1.3
15.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 21: Tests administered in formal Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs by an Other Staff in the school.

	Tests Given by Other	Frequency	Percent[a]
1.	Keystone Visual Screening Test	10	12.5
2.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	4	5.0
3.	Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	3	3.8
4.	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	3	3.8
5.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	3	3.8
6.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	3	3.8
7.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	3	3.8
8.	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	2	2.5
9.	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	2	2.5
10.	Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	2	2.5
11.	Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	2	2.5
12.	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	2	2.5
13.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	1	1.3
14.	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	1	1.3
15.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	1	1.3
16.	Raven-Progressive Matrix	1	1.3
17.	Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	1	1.3
18.	KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	1	1.3

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

RESPONDENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Respondents were asked to make recommendations regarding an identification procedure and ideal measurement tools. Over 95 percent of the respondents indicated the need to conduct an intake interview (see Table 22). Additionally, more than 60 percent considered a review of previous school records necessary. An administered assessment tool was also considered important for identification purposes by one-third of the respondents. Last, 22 percent of the respondents believed a review of previous medical records relevant when attempting to identify LDA students. Table 23 illustrates tests recommended by those respondents. The most highly recommended test was the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-educational Battery.

TABLE 22: Identification procedures recommended by twenty percent or more respondents associated with formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA).

	Procedure	Number of College Respondents[a]	Percent[b]
1.	Conduct Intake Interview	65	95.6
2.	Review Previous School Records	42	61.8
3.	Administer Assessment Tool (formal or informal test)	23	33.8
4.	Review Previous Medical Records	15	22.1

[a]Sixty-eight out of a possible 80 responded. Fourteen respondents did not reply to the question.
[b]Based upon sixty-eight respondents.

TABLE 23: Tests recommended by twenty percent or more respondents associated with formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification or assessment purposes.

	Test	Number of College Respondents[a]	Percent[b]
1.	Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-educational Test Battery	34	51.5
2.	Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	29	43.9
3.	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	24	36.4
4.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	18	27.3
5.	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	16	24.2
6.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	15	22.7

[a]Sixty-six out of a possible 80 responded. Fourteen respondents did not reply to the question.

[b]Based upon sixty-six respondents.

DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

There was no one procedure or methodology employed throughout California's community colleges forthe identification and assessment of LDA students. This diversity of practice would appear to derive from the basic philosophy of local autonomy to meet local needs that exists in the system. Yet, despite this diversity, a consistency exists among those colleges which run formal programs for their LDA students. Most colleges provided similar means for the identification and diagnosis of potential LDA students: intake interviewing, referring procedures and agencies, involved personnel, and a basic agreement as to assessment tool usage. Even the recommendations forwarded by the respondents were consistent in nature. Again, respondents seem to agree on basic procedures and assessment tools. Further, though the rank-order of recommended tests differed from those tests currently used to assess LDA students, every test on the recommended list also appeared on the in-use list. The same findings arise when comparing the recommended identification procedure to the in-use identification practices.

Based upon the survey results and the findings from the Ostertag and Baker's (1982) report on LDA Programs in California Community Colleges, the following recommendations are suggested for community college which serve students in an LDA program:

1. Implementation of a specifically defined identification and assessment approach, I.E.P. development and delivery system for all LDA students;

2. collection of assessment data on all students which measures and identified a student's discrepancy;

3. adoption of appropriate, validated and reliable assessment tools;

4. implementation of IEP's which clearly indicate the assessment data, discrepancy, needs, goals and programming methods for working with said students;

5. adoption of a multidisciplinary team approach delivery systems for all LDA students;

6. collection of consistent data reporting methods securely maintained on the above material;

7. maintenance of confidentiality on the above material;

8. implementation of active in-service programming for faculty, advisory board and community;

9. an on-going review of current services and practices to maintain quality programming for LDA students; and

10. participation of staff in professional organizations concerned with the LDA individual. It should be noted that many of California's community colleges currently adhere to the above recommendations.

Further research is necessary concerning our community college LDA students and their programming needs. An extension and updating of current program models, such as the Learning Disabilities Handbook (1980), to specify procedures, discuss appropriate assessment instruments, identify new technology and findings will greatly benefit all concerned. Research is also needed to carlify the questions concerning the discrepancy definition model: how do you measure discrepancy; what tools do you use; etc.? Lastly, the purpose and goal of LDA college programs must be defined. Until these above needs and questions have concrete answers for the adult LDA student will have difficulties reaching their potential.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alley, G. and Deshler, D. 1979. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: strategies and methods. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing.

California Association for Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled. 1982. Unpublished report. California Community College Chancellor's Office. June, 1982.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. 1980. Learning disabilities handbook. Sacramento, California.

Clark, F. L. (ed.) 1981. "Major research findings of the University of Kansas institute for research in learning disabilities." Institute for research in learning disabilities research report No. 31. October, 1981.

Compton, C. 1980. A guide to 65 tests for special education. Belmont, California: Fearon Education/Pitman Learning, Inc.

Cordoni, B. 1982. "Post-secondary education: where do we go from here?" Journal of learning disabilities Vol. 15, No. 5, p. 265. May, 1982

Cullinan, D. and Epstein, M. H. 1979. Special education for adolescents. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

McLoughlin, J. A. and Lewis, R. B. 1981. Assessing special students. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Mann, L., Goodman, L. and Wiederholt, P. H. 1978. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ostertag, B. A. and Baker, R. E. 1982. "Learning disabled programs in California community colleges." Journal of learning disabilities. Vol. 15, No. 9, pp. 535-538. November, 1982.

Ostertag, B. A. and Baker, R. E. 1982. Report of the California community college learning disabled programs. Sacramento, CA: Community College Chancellor's Office.

Ostertag, B. A. and Schnorr, J. M. 1981. "Reading instruction in secondary learning disabled programs." Academic Therapy 17:2, pp. 163-169. November, 1981.

Swan, R. J. 1982. "A counseling model for promoting academic success of learning disabled students at the university level." Unpublished paper. California State University, Long Beach. February, 1982.

Swanson, H. L. and Watson, B. L. 1982. Educational and psychological assessment of exceptional children. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.

Weller, C. and Strawser, S. 1980. "Detecting learning disabilities in the college-age student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 3, Spring, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E. and Algozzine, B. 1979. "Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 2, Fall, 1979.

TABLE 24: Purpose of administered assessment instruments used in twenty-five percent or more of the formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA).

Test[b]	Frequency of Purpose[a]									
	Achievement	I.Q./Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual-Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language
1. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	54	5	3	1	0	0	52	49	3	32
2. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	50	13	0	1	0	0	39	41	3	14
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	8	24	0	1	6	0	0	6	32	1
4. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	3	14	26	36	43	0	0	0	22	6
5. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	36	30	18	23	25	1	26	31	18	25
6. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	2	1	0	0	42	0	1	1	0	0
7. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	7	39	13	12	8	0	6	1	8	0
8. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	13	0	1	0	0	1	38	0	1	1
9. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	13	2	0	3	4	0	2	32	3	1
10. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	0	4	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	0	0	1	0	28	1	0	1	4	1
12. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	11	0	0	3	6	0	0	30	0	0
13. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	23	2	0
15. Raven-Progressive Matrix	3	24	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	23	1	0
17. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	1	0
18. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	2	2	7	12	19	0	0	10	10	0
19. Keystone Visual Screening Test	0	0	2	17	2	3	0	2	0	1
20. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	1	2	1

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

[b]Rank order from Table 3.

TABLE 25: Personnel and Evaluators of administered assessment instruments used in twenty-five percent or more of the formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA).

Test	Frequency of Personnel and Evaluators[a]						
	Learning Disability Spec	Psychologist	Speech Therapist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
1. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	58	8	2	6	3	15	3
2. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	53	6	3	2	2	8	3
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R)	45	4	11	1	2	2	3
4. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	41	2	7	0	0	1	1
5. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	41	4	3	1	1	2	2
6. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	37	3	12	0	0	3	2
7. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	10	26	0	0	6	0	4
8. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	38	2	0	1	0	8	1
9. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	28	1	2	0	1	3	3
10. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	17	15	0	0	3	0	0
11. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	25	0	12	1	0	5	1
12. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	27	2	0	1	1	1	2
13. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	5	1	0	2	22	2	3
14. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	23	0	0	3	0	7	2
15. Raven-Progressive Matric	22	4	1	0	4	3	1
16. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	19	0	0	2	0	5	2
17. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	16	0	7	0	0	0	1
18. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability (ITPA)	15	1	9	0	0	0	0
19. Keystone Visual Screening Test	13	0	0	0	1	3	10
20. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery	16	2	5	0	0	0	1

[a]Based upon 80 respondents. More than one response possible.

TABLE 26: Intake interviews conducted on potential students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Intake Interviews Conducted	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	80	75.5	75	93.8
No	3	2.8	2	2.5
Sometimes	5	4.7	3	3.8
Missing Responses	18	17.0	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 27: Acceptance of assessment results from other agencies for placement of students into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Acceptance of Assessment	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	71.7	70	87.5
No	11	10.4	9	11.3
Missing Responses	19	17.9	1	1.3
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 28: Formal assessments administered to potential candidates for acceptance into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Formal Assessments Administered	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	66	67.3	65	81.3
No	8	7.5	3	3.8
Sometimes	15	14.2	12	15.0
Missing Responses	17	16.0	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

42

Code No. _____

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE LEARNING DISABLED AVERAGE: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to all items (based upon fiscal year 80-81 unless otherwise specified)

1) Title of Respondent (Please check the one that best applies):

1. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Instructor)
2. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Coordinator, L.D. Program)
3. /__/ Coordinator/Enabler/College Specialist (Total Handicapped Services)
4. /__/ Psychologist
5. /__/ Counselor
6. /__/ Aide
7. /__/ Other Faculty (identify)_____

2) Does your school have a formal program for Learning Disabled Average (L.D.A.) college students?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Other (identify)_____

3) Indicate the NUMBER of L.D.A. served. /_____/

4) Indicate the NUMBER of potential L.D.A. students on your campus who are not receiving services. /_____/

If you are not serving any L.D.A. students, please stop here and return the questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope. Other, please continue.

5) Indicate the NUMBER of L.D.A. students served experiencing primary academic difficulty in the following skills:

1. /__/ Reading
2. /__/ Math
3. /__/ Writing
4. /__/ Oral Communication
5. /__/ Spelling
6. /__/ Other (describe)_____

6) In the past three years, approximately:

1. What percentage of students served by your L.D. program have obtained A.A. degrees? /_____%/
2. What percentage of students served by your L.D. program have obtained vocational certificates? /_____%/
3. What percentage of students being served by your L.D. program EXPECT to transfer to four-year colleges or universities? /_____%/
4. What percentage of students being served by your L.D. program have ACTUALLY transferred to four-year colleges or universities? /_____%/

7) How is a student initially referred as a possible candidate for the L.D. program? Please check any of the below which are appropriate.

1. ☐ Faculty
2. ☐ Counselor
3. ☐ L.D. Specialist
4. ☐ Psychologist
5. ☐ Parents/Relatives
6. ☐ High Schools
7. ☐ Law Enforcement Agencies
8. ☐ Department of Rehabilitation
9. ☐ Social Service Agency
10. ☐ Religious Institutions
11. ☐ Peers (of student)
12. ☐ College Placement Exam
13. ☐ Self
14. ☐ Other (describe)_____

8) Are Formal Assessments administered by your college L.D. program to potential students?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No 3. ☐ Sometimes

9) Do you use assessment results from referring agencies for student placement purposes into your program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No

If you responded "Yes," please list those agencies:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

10) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student admission to your L.D. Program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No 3. ☐ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team. (Example: 7. /2/ Counselor).

1. ☐ Student
2. ☐ Parent/Relative
3. ☐ Psychologist
4. ☐ L.D. Specialist
5. ☐ Enabler/College Specialist
6. ☐ Speech and Language Therapist
7. ☐ Counselor
8. ☐ Social Worker
9. ☐ Medical Doctor
10. ☐ Other Faculty
11. ☐ Other (describe)_____
12. ☐ Other (describe)_____

11) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student Individualized Education Programs (I.E.P's)?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No 3. ☐ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team (Example: 3. /1/ Psychologist).

1. ☐ Student
2. ☐ Parent/Relative
3. ☐ Psychologist
4. ☐ L.D. Specialist
5. ☐ Enabler/College Specialist
6. ☐ Speech and Language Therapist
7. ☐ Counselor
8. ☐ Social Worker
9. ☐ Medical Doctor
10. ☐ Other Faculty
11. ☐ Other (describe)_____
12. ☐ Other (describe)_____

12) Do you maintain an active Individualized Education Program (IEP) for all students receiving services in your L.D. program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No

13) In what ways does your program academically assist L.D. students? Please check any of the below which apply?

A. TUTORIAL SUPPORT:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. L.D. Specialist			
2. Peer-Adult			
3. Aide			
4. Other Faculty			

52

B. COUNSELING INTERNAL TO THE L.D. PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

53

13) Continued

C. COUNSELING EXTERNAL TO THE L.D.A. PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

14) Indicate any of the below additional adjustments implemented by your program/college to aid the L.D.:

1. /____/ Length of time permitted to complete degree requirements waived or extended.
2. /____/ Length of time permitted to complete individual course requirements extended.
3. /____/ Substitutions permitted in course requirements (Example: substituting special remedial course for Introductory English).
4. /____/ Auxiliary support services provided for students to assist in keeping up with educational demands.

   Check those support services your provide:

   a. /__/ Reader Services
   b. /__/ Notetaker Services
   c. /__/ Registration Assistance
   d. /__/ Diagnostic Learning Assessment
   e. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   f. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   g. /__/ Other (describe)_____

54

5. /____/ Required course curriculum revised (Example: Eliminating term paper in favor of taped project). Identify_____
6. /____/ Arrangements available for notetakers or other methods of reproducing lecture texts. Identify_____

55

7. /____/ Learning Center available to provide appropriate remediation for students in reading, math, study skills, etc.
8. /____/ Classes scheduled to meet problems related to physical or emotional disability, or other special needs.

14) Continued

9. ☐ Other (identify)_____

15) Do you provide in-service training for college faculty and staff?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No

16) Check any of the below areas in which Informal Tests (Teacher-made or College-developed) are used to identify L.D. students.

1. ☐ Over-all Achievement
2. ☐ Classroom Behavior
3. ☐ Reading
4. ☐ Spoken Language
5. ☐ Written Language
6. ☐ Intellectual Performance/Adaptive Behavior
7. ☐ Specific Learning Abilities/Modalities
8. ☐ Arithmetic
9. ☐ Spelling
10. ☐ Other (identify)_____

17) Do you conduct an Intake Interview with prospective students for the L.D. program?

1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No 3. ☐ Sometimes

18) Please identify any of the below tests used regularly to identify and assess L.D.A. students. Check the appropriate "Purpose" and "Evaluator" for each test given:

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance	Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational		L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												1. AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale-Public School Version (1975)							
												2. Adaptive Behavior Inventory For Children (1977)							
												3. Adult Base Learning Exam/ABLE (1978)							
												4. Behavior Rating Profile (1978)							
												5. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test (1938)							
												6. Botel Reading Inventory (1978)							
												7. Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills (1977)							
												8. Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills (1978)							
												9. Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (1978)							
												10. Burks' Behavior Rating Scales (1977)							
												11. Carrow Elicited Language Inventory (1974)							
												12. Classroom Reading Inventory/Silvaroli (1976)							
												13. Clinical Evaluation of Language Functions (1980)							

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												14. Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (1981)							
												15. Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude (1978)							
												16. Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (1967)							
												17. Diagnostic Reading Scales/Spache (1972)							
												18. Diagnostic Test and Self-Help in Arithmetic (1975)							
												19. Diagnostic Word Patterns (1978)							
												20. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised (1976)							
												21. Draw-A-Man (1976)							
												22. Draw-A-Person (1976)							
												23. Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (1955)							
												24. FIRO-B (1976)							
												25. Forer Structured Sentence Completion Test (1976)							
												26. Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception (1966)							
												27. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (1978)							
												28. Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Test (1962)							

18) Continued

PURPOSE													EVALUATOR							
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational	TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
											29. Gates-Russell Spelling Diagnostic Test (1940)							
											30. Gilmore Oral Reading Test (1968)							
											31. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery (1976)							
											32. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination (1970)							
											33. Gray Oral Reading Test (1967)							
											34. Houston Test for Language Development (1963)							
											35. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities/ITPA (1968)							
											36. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test (1973)							
											37. Keystone Vision Screening (1976)							
											38. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test/LAC (1971)							
											39. Malcomesius Specific Language Disability Test (1967)							
											40. Mecham Verbal Language Development Scale (1959)							
											41. Mooney Problem Checklists (1950)							

49

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												42. Motor-Free Visual Perception Test (1972)							
												43. Peabody Individual Achievement Test/PIAT (1970)							
												44. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Revised (1980)							
												45. Picture Story Language Test/PSLT (1965)							
												46. Progressive Matrics-Raven (1975)							
												47. Purdue Perceptual-Motor Survey (1966)							
												48. Reading Miscue Inventory (1978)							
												49. Road Map Test (1976)							
												50. Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Test of Word Analysis Skills (1976)							
												51. Sequential Tests of Education Progress (1963)							
												52. Slosson Intelligence Test/SIT (1975)							
												53. Southern California Kinesthesia & Tactile Perception Tests/Ayres (1972)							
												54. SRA Math Probes (1973)							
												55. Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (1973)							
												56. Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test (1976)							

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												57. Steenburgen Quick Math Screening Test (1978)							
												58. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (1981)							
												59. Sucher-Allred Reading Placement Inventory (1973)							
												60. System Fore (1979)							
												61. System for Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (1977)							
												62. Test of Adolescent Language/TAL (1980)							
												63. Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language-Carrow (1973)							
												64. Test of Language Development/TOLD (1977)							
												65. Test of Reading Comprehension/TORC (1978)							
												66. Test of Written Language/TOWL (1978)							
												67. Test of Written Spelling/TOWS (1976)							
												68. Visual Aural Digit Span Test/VADS (1977)							
												69. Vineland Social Maturity Scale/VSMS (1965)							
												70. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Revised/WAIS-R (1980							

18) Continued

PURPOSE													TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR						
Achievement	Intellectual Performance	Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Classroom Behavior	Arithmetic	Reading	Spoken Language	Written Language	Vocational		L.D. Specialist	Psychologist	Speech Pathologist	Faculty	Counselor	Aide	Other
												71. Wechsler Memory Scale (1980)							
												72. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test (1975)							
												73. Wide Range Achievement Test/WRAT (1978)							
												74. Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (1977)							
												75. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (1973)							
												76. Other (identify)_____							
												77. Other (identify)_____							
												78. Other (identify)_____							
												79. Other (identify)_____							
												80. Other (identify)_____							

19) What do you believe should be the minimum assessment procedures and tools utilized to identify potential L.D. students for placement purposes? Please list, in priority order, the minimum procedures and tests that should be used. You need not respond to every possible item blank.

A. Identification Procedure (Intake Interview, Checklists, etc.)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

B. Assessment Tools (Formal and Informal Tests)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

C. Multi-disciplinary Team Members (Testing)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

D. Multi-disciplinary Team Members (Placement)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

19) Continued

E. Multi-Disciplinary Team Members (I.E.P. Development)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

20) Please list any additional comments: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IMMEDIATELY IN THE ACCOMPANYING, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

APPENDIX C

FORMAL LDA PROGRAM SITES

LDA Programs in CCC 54/55

FORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES[a]

Alameda, College of
Allan Hancock College
Antelope Valley College
Bakersfield College
Butte College
Cabrillo College
Canada College
Canyons, College of
Cerritos College
Cerro Coso Community College
Chabot College
Chaffey College
Citrus College
Coastline
Columbia Junior College
Compton Community College
Contra Costa College
Crafton Hills College
Cuesta College
Cuyamaca College
Cypress College
De Anza College
Desert, College of
Diablo Valley College
El Camino College
Evergreen
Foothill College
Fresno City College
Fullerton College
Gavilan College
Glendale College
Grossmont College
Imperial Valley College
Indian Valley College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Lassen College
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Mission College

(Continued on next page)

---

[a]Formal Programs are defined as having:

(1) an LDA Specialist,

(2) a standard, routine assessment procedure for each student;

(3) and the option of offering special classes for their LDA students.

FORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA
(continued)

Los Medanos College
Marin, College of
Mendocino College
Merritt College
Mission College
Modesto Junior College
Monterey Peninsula College
Moorpark College
Mount San Antonio College
Mount San Jacinto College
Napa College
Orange Coast College
Oxnard College
Palomar College
Pasadena City College
Redwoods, College of the
Rio Hondo College
Riverside City College
Saddleback College
San Bernardino Valley College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
San Francisco, City College of
San Joaquin Delta College
San Jose City College
San Mateo, College of
Santa Ana College
Santa Barbara City College
Santa Monica City College
Santa Rosa Junior College
Sequoias, College of the
Shasta College
Sierra College
Siskiyous, College of
Skyline College
Southwestern College
Ventura College
West Los Angeles College
West Valley College
Yuba College

---

[a]Formal Programs are defined as having:

(1) an LDA Specialist;

(2) a standard, rountine assessment procedure for each student;

(3) and the option of offering special classes for their LDA students.

APPENDIX D

INFORMAL LDA PROGRAM SITES

INFORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES[a]

East Los Angeles College
Feather River College
Golden West College
Hartnell College
Laney College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Los Angeles Valley College
Ohlone College
Solano Community College
Victor Valley Community College
Vista College
West Hills College

---

[a]Some type of service other than Formal Programming offered for LDA students.

APPENDIX E

NULL LDA PROGRAM SITES

59/60
LDA Programs in CCC

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
WITHOUT SERVICES FOR LDA STUDENTS[a]

American River College
Barstow College
Cosumnes River College
Kings River College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Merced College
Mira Costa College
Palo Verde College
Porterville City College
Sacramento City College
San Diego Evening College
San Deigo Miramar College
Taft College

---

[a]No special services provided for LDA students.

STUDENT ASSISTANT VOUCHER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

1. Every blank on this form must be COMPLETED before it is submitted to the Payroll Office.
2. Students must be currently enrolled at CSUS.
3. The oath must be signed in the Payroll Office, Administration 163, before work is started, if the student has not received a pay warrant from CSUS in the past six months.
4. The student's name and/or number of exemptions can be changed only by filing another W-4 form in the Payroll Office.
5. Correct Social Security Number must be recorded on timesheet or it can not be processed for payment.
6. Rate of pay must be indicated and be approved by the supervisor.
7. All time must be entered in hours and in 10ths of hours as shown below:

6 minutes = .1		36 minutes = .6	
12 minutes = .2		42 minutes = .7	
18 minutes = .3		48 minutes = .8	
24 mintues = .4		54 minutes = .9	
30 minutes = .5		60 minutes = 1.0	

8. All changes made on this form must be initialed by the person making the correction.
9. Timesheets must be completed and submitted with the Attendance Report to the Payroll Office before the end of the last working day of the pay period.
10. Pay warrants may be picked up from the designated person in the School/Department/Agency approximately the fifth of the month.

MUST BE PRINTED OR TYPED:

FIRST NAME _____ INITIAL _____ LAST NAME _____

DEPARTMENT/AGENCY _____

MONTH (pay period) _____ YEAR _____

BIRTHDATE _____ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER ___/___/___

NEW EMPLOYEE ____ OLD EMPLOYEE ____

DATE	HOURS	MIN*	DATE	HOURS	MIN*	DATE	HOURS	MIN*
20			30			9		
21			31			10		
22			1			11		
23			2			12		
24			3			13		
25			4			14		
26			5			15		
27			6			16		
28			7			17		
29			8			18		
						19		

MONTH OF JUNE

20		27	
21		28	
22		29	
23		30	
24			
25			
26			

TOTAL HOURS: _____

RATE OF PAY: $ _____

*See Item #7

I Certify that I have signed the oath in the Payroll Office, Administration 163.

_____
STUDENT EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE

_____
SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE

_____
STAFF TIMEKEEPER'S SIGNATURE

PAY PERIOD SCHEDULE

Jul 1 thru Jul 19	Dec 20 thru Jan 19
Jul 20 thru Aug 19	Jan 20 thru Feb 19
Aug 20 thru Sep 19	Feb 20 thru Mar 19
Sep 20 thru Oct 19	Mar 20 thru Apr 19
Oct 20 thru Nov 19	Apr 20 thru May 19
Nov 20 thru Dec 19	May 20 thru Jun 30

78

Revised 6/79 /CSUS 0719

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
WRRC ® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUN 3 1983